

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending.

Claims 1-6 are rejected.

Claim 1 is amended for reasons of clarity.

No new matter has been added.

No new claims have been added.

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1-6 in view of the following arguments.

Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Rejection of Claims 1 and 4-6

The Claims 1 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot (US 2006/0156362 A1, hereafter referred to as 'Perrot') in view of Ohno et al. (US 2003/0149985 A1, hereafter referred to as 'Ohno') and Vare et al. (US PGPUB 2006/0013153 A1, hereafter referred to as 'Vare'). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

With regard to claim 1, the Office Action rejects this claim for reasons of obviousness in view of a combination of the three documents cited above. The Applicants respectfully disagree that the invention as claimed in claim 1 would have been obvious for the person skilled in the art at the time of the invention. The invention concerns discovery of DVB services offered on an IP network by a terminal connected to the IP network, the discovery information being comprised in NIT and SDT tables that are comprised in Transport Streams (TS). All cited documents teach away from the claimed invention.

Perrot lacks, among others, teaching of any use of NIT and SDT for comprising discovery information for DVB services transmitted over an IP network as is admitted in the Office Action.

Ohno teaches away from the invention, mentioning obtaining of an URL for download of data via the Internet from an EIT that is received via RF (Radio-Frequency) [0051]: '(...) *broadcast carrier, an event information table* (...)'. Paragraph

[0111] explains differences between Fig 1 and Fig 17, the latter including a connection to the Internet in addition to the RF tuner, and explicitly confirms that reception of broadcast wave with regard to Fig. 17 is the same as for Fig.1, that is, via a RF tuner 102 [0111]: *'the basic operations of the CPU includes all the functions of the CPU of Fig.1 described above. Since the basic operations of the CPU such as the operation for receiving a broadcast wave with the antenna (...) are the same as those in the first embodiment (...)'*. Clearly, according to Ohno, the broadcast services are received via RF broadcast transmission, not via the IP network. Ohno is about traditional RF transmission of services and standardized use of NIT and STD, see [0046] and [0051]. The Internet connection 'I' of Fig. 17 is merely used to fetch data broadcast data from an Internet source in case a download of such data, comprised in a TS received via RF, would be interrupted due to a channel change ([0116]-[0117]). See also our arguments provided in our response to the previous Office Action.

Vare also teaches away from the claimed invention. As Ohno, Vare is about transmission of services over an RF network, notwithstanding that the data transmitted over RF may comprise IP/MAC streams [0031] or any other IP-encoded data [0027], the receiver device remains a traditional RF receiver [0026]: 'DVB-T' and 'power saving principles of the DVB transmission in the receiver device'. These power transmission saving principles are related to off and on switching of the RF receiver during inactive periods (see also [0026]) and the principles are not applicable to non-RF reception.

Thus, all cited document teach away from the invention. Perrot, discussing transmission of services over IP, does not teach reuse of NIT and SDT. Ohno and Vare, when discussing transmission of services and use of NIT and SDT, relate use of NIT and SDT to traditional transmission over RF and reception of Transport Streams comprising services via an RF tuner device.

The skilled in the art would thus not have found any teaching in the cited documents allowing him to find the rather surprising solution to reuse NIT and SDT for discovery of service information related to services offered on an IP network according to claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicants submit that the invention as claimed by claim 1 is patentable and therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 4 and 5 depend on allowable claim 1. The Applicants submit that these claims are therefore also allowable.

Apparatus claim 6 comprises similar limitations as allowable method claim 1 in terms of means and the Applicants submit that claim 6 is therefore also in condition for allowance.

Rejection of Claim 2

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot and Ohno in further view of Cao (US Patent Publication 2004/0187161, hereafter referred to as 'Cao'). The Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends on allowable claim 1 and adds further distinguishing features to that claim.

Rejection of Claim 3

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot and Ohno in further view of Van Willigen (U.S. Patent 7,386,879, hereafter referred to as 'Van Willigen'). The Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends on allowable claim 1 and adds further distinguishing features to that claim.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
R. Schaefer et al.

Serial No. 10/574,328

PF030154
Customer No. 24498

By: /Joel M. Fogelson/
Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43,613

Tel. No. (818) 480-5318

Thomson Licensing, LLC
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
June 1, 2011